

## REMARKS AND WRITTEN STATEMENT AS TO SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

In an Office Action mailed October 5, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 15-19 and 51 as being anticipated by EP 0 233 704 to Burkhard, claims 15, 19-21, 23, 25-28, 32, 34-37, 51 and 52 as being anticipated by USP 5,087,253 to Cooper and claims 16-18, 22, 24, 29-31 and 33 as being made obvious over Cooper. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney on December 7, 2004 to discuss claims 15 and 28 in view of Burkhard and Cooper as set forth below.

During the interview, the Examiner explained her position that claims 15 and 28 were not limited to tab members extending from the *same* side edge of the body panel. Applicants have amended claims 15 and 28 to clarify that the tab members extend laterally inward in the same direction from *the same* side edge.

The Examiner also explained her position that the claims were not limited to the tab members being longitudinally offset from each other. Again, Applicants have clarified that the tab members are longitudinally offset *from each other*.

Having clarified the claim recitations, Applicants submit that the claims clearly distinguish Burkhard and Cooper for the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed July 15, 2004, namely:

1. Burkhard does not disclose or suggest a pair of tab members extending from the *same* side edge.
2. Cooper does not disclose a pair of tab members, extending from the same side edge, that independently releasably and refastenably engage the body panel. Either the fastener of Cooper is the tab member or the body panel, but not both. This is especially true when the tab members are required to *independently* engage the body panel as now recited in claims 15 and 28 – e.g., it is not possible for the hook material to engage the opposite body panel independent of the loop material.
3. Cooper does not disclose or suggest in Figures 16 and 17 that the

fastener portions 266, 268 are longitudinally offset from *each other*.


For these reasons, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over Burkhard and Cooper and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. No additional fees are believed to be due. Should any additional fees be deemed appropriate, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.

If for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance and another interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4713.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: December 7, 2004

By:

  
Andrew D. Stover  
Reg. No. 38,629  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE LTD.  
Post Office Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_**

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**